

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLOR FAWTHROP

Item 4.4 - 23 The Covert

Mr Chairman

In future I do believe it would be sensible for these applications to contain the call-in reasons submitted by the Councillor initiating the Call In, as that would prevent a lot of repetition and would help distil the issues for member.

There are two primary reasons for the Call In

- 1) The impact on the neighbouring amenity of no.21 The Covert as well as the visual outlook from that address
- 2) The impact of the proposals on The Covert Conservation Area, particularly the unbalancing of the pair of Noel Rees semi-detached properties, which would be visible from the street scene. This needs to be taken in context of both the Conservation Area and the Area of Special Residential Character descriptions.

In fairness to the applicant they have revised the scheme and pulled the extension further backwards from the front building line to help mitigate the impact upon the street scene of the unbalancing of this pair of semi-detached properties.

Whilst the report on page 79 paragraph 7.13 refers to other properties that have side extensions these are historic, so for example no. 27 was 2014, both No. 44 and 46 were in 2016 all way before the Conservation Area was introduced and before the current local Plan was adopted. Two things have to be borne in mind firstly there is no such thing as a precedent in planning as each case is considered on its own merits and that since those applications the material planning considerations have changed considerably with the introduction of the Conservation Area and new local Plan. Even before this became a Conservation Area there was an appeal at no. 44 The Covert for a roof light which was turned down by the inspectorate, which is another material planning consideration and must have a strong bearing on this application given the Local Plan was then in force. I have circulated a copy for members consideration and refer to the decision in paragraph 5. the inspector states "the symmetry between pairs of houses is of importance in defining the character of the area." It also goes on to state in paragraph 7. "The effect whilst being relatively small, caused imbalance to the pair of dwellings. Its projection appears awkward, overly modern and incongruous. Owing to this unique setting, it does not respect, enhance and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC." All of which could be applied to this application.

Within the report in paragraph 7.8 it states that the harm has to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including optimal viable use. The report does not demonstrate the public benefits of the application, particularly given that the existing

side space is considerably eroded as a result of the proposal, notwithstanding what is stated in paragraph 7.14.

I also take argument with paragraph 7.15 which is clearly wrong, as it doesn't preserve the character of the ASRC or Conservation Area, whether the impact is detrimental is a matter of opinion where I would take a different view to that contained within the report. I would apply Policy 6b which states "space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area;" The side space is part of the character of the area and makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and ASRC,

Therefore I would conclude that the application is contrary to policies 6b, 8, 41 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan and ask that colleagues propose that this application be refused. On the grounds stated.

If for some reason members are not with me on this then I would ask that conditions be attached to the application to add protections to the area those being a the removal of PD rights for the dwellinghouse which could allow the Conservation Area standards to be eroded as well as maintaining the property as a family home by removing rights to convert this to an HMO.